

The image shows the front cover of an antique book. The spine is on the left, bound in dark brown leather. The main cover is decorated with a vibrant marbled paper pattern featuring repeating, wavy, scalloped shapes in shades of deep red, blue, and gold. A small white rectangular label is affixed to the lower-left portion of the cover, containing the text 'FC 472', 'B82', and '1844'. A small red and white sticker is visible on the spine near the bottom.

FC 472  
B82  
1844

San Buchanan, Repac Dep.

1941

765

U

FIRST SERIES

OF

FIVE LETTERS,

AGAINST

THE BALDWIN FACTION,

BY

AN ADVOCATE

OF

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT,

AND OF

THE NEW COLLEGE BILL.

*Isaac Newkoman*

TORONTO:

PRINTED AT THE BRITISH COLONIST OFFICE.

1844.

## PREFACE.

---

THE writer of these letters had as his object, in coming very reluctantly before the public in the *British Colonist*, to show, that Mr. Baldwin and his late colleagues had only party, and not patriotic or provincial objects in view, as politicians.

He has endeavoured to establish, and he hopes successfully, that as EXECUTIVE COUNCILLORS, they have been the greatest possible delinquents; and that *as a party* they deserve to get no credit even for their LEGISLATIVE ACTS, however good, as these were evidently brought forward at the last moment, and merely as a means of creating political capital in Upper Canada, where before, they were positively *without sameness of object with the population*, except in their supposed oneness with the country as to the *principle* of Responsible Government, but of which popular principle their continuing in the Council in order to wield the Government's influence in *Legislation for electioneering purposes*, was a most dishonest and unpardonable violation.

The writer has also wished to show—

1st—That between the Upper Canada Reform Party and the Radical Faction lately in power, there really exists a gulf as wide as between Loyalty to the limited and constitutional Monarchy of Britain, and devotion to the Democratic practices, if not principles, of the neighbouring Republic.

2nd—That in Upper Canada no strong or overwhelming and permanent "*connection party*" can be formed by Loyalists, unless the members of the High Church Faction assimilate their College views, to those of the mass of the Colonists (as they have happily at last done, their views of Responsible Government), and that to this there is now neither any reasonable nor legal objection, since his Excellency, the Chancellor of the University, has already approved of the principle of the new College Bill, and sanctioned its introduction into Parliament.

# LETTER I.

TORONTO, 20th December, 1843.

J. H. Price, Esq., M.P.P., and James Lesslie, Esq.

DEAR SIRS,—Immediately after you called on me this morning, to express the wish of yesterday's meeting at the *Temperance House*, that as I was prominent in extorting from Lord Sydenham, the acknowledgment of Responsible Government as a Colonial principle, I should now take part in the coming demonstration in favor of the Ministers who have lately resigned,—I gave the subject my most serious attention; and on my way home this afternoon, I called at Mr. Lesslie's, to intimate to you my decision.

I decline being a party to the demonstration, because I feel that it has other objects than the simple assertion of the *principle* of Responsible Government, for which few men have made or are willing to make greater sacrifices than myself.

The doubt I this morning expressed to you, that those with whom the demonstration originates, have objects that I consider unsafe, has been confirmed by a perusal of the two last *Examiners*, which I had not had leisure previously to refer to. This paper you will admit to be the organ of the late Executive. It *must* be so indeed,—for, as you well know, Mr. Baldwin is nothing without Mr. Hincks, and Mr. Hincks nothing without Mr. Baldwin, however much good reason each has to distrust the other's principles, or practicability as public men, since their alienation at the time the latter deserted Mr. Baldwin and his Lower Canadian friends to support Lord Sydenham.

Now, as I find that in the *Examiner*, a large section of the *tried* friends of Responsible Government are loaded with contempt and injustice, and spurned as "Moderates," I feel that as a Moderate and a Loyalist, I would be stultifying myself to give any countenance to Mr. Hincks and his clique. On the principles of and fighting along side of "Moderate" men, he was a benefit to the country, but by adopting afresh the character of Mackenzie and his misguided associates, he must be a curse to the extent of his influence, which I hope is not great throughout the country. Mr. Hincks knows full well, that though Mr. Baldwin deserves the greatest credit for his advocacy of Responsible Government, at a time when it was little understood, and when advocated only by men of doubtful loyalty, no attention was paid to it, yet, that but for the "Moderates," whom he now affects to despise, that great and invaluable constitutional principle would not be in practical operation this day.

The "Moderates" never lost sight of Responsible Government as the GREAT OBJECT to be attained at the Union (and to secure which to Upper Canada was the chief use of the Union), while Mr. Baldwin and his particular friends, had as their first political move to join with the Lower Canadians, who, had Responsible Government been *first* granted, might have preferred as friends the Conservatives or Loyalists of Upper Canada. On the alliance being formed, Mr. Baldwin and the Lower Canadians

would have driven Lord Sydenham from the Province (in consequence of asserted misgovernment in *Lower Canada*), and the PRINCIPLE of local self-government would have been at least temporarily lost to Canada, but that the now despised "Moderates" stood by Lord Sydenham.

'Tis true that if Responsible Government were denied to Canada, its connection with the Mother Country would not be of many year's duration; and knowing that such is the opinion of Mr. Baldwin and his friends, the question in my mind which is raised by their insane conduct then and now, is, WHETHER THEY CARE A STRAW ABOUT THE CONNECTION? Though they know that the disruption of the connection would flow from the denial of local self-government, they think the thrusting back into place and power of themselves as a Ministry (a thing impossible) a far more important consideration, than that of the connection with England; for the readers of the *Examiner* are enjoined to prefer at the Elections, the enemies of Responsible Government, and of every thing liberal, the Family Compact, to any man who *dare*s to be independent of Mr. Hincks, forsooth! This is tyranny of the most disgusting sort (from such a quarter too), and for my part, I cease from this day, to view the late Executive as true and disinterested friends of Responsible Government, and of the peace and safety of the Province.

As a proof of the *Examiner's* wilful unfairness, it (besides other insults to Sir Charles Metcalfe) institutes a comparison between his Excellency and Sir F. B. Head, to the disadvantage of Sir Charles Metcalfe! before the ink is dry which recorded his colleague Mr. Sullivan's admiration of his character, and when Mr. Hincks' own written opinion of his Excellency is, that he is the ablest man, without exception, that ever held the destinies of Canada.

The sameness of views on the subject of the *principle* of Colonial government, seems all that the "Moderates" have had in common with Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Hincks' party, whom their *new friends*, the Tories, have always called the Republican or Rebel party in Upper Canada.

My own opinion of Mr. Baldwin's personal *intentions* is very high; but I now see clearly that, from a variety of causes, his character can never be sufficiently commanding, to enable him to call into existence, out of the elements in his power, *a party at once loyal and liberal*, and moulded to his own views. Even an honest man in *his* situation is not a safe one. The natural vanity of a public man must be gratified by power and success; and the safety of Mr. Baldwin's views can only arise from the safety of the character of his out and out supporters; for to their views he must conform his, in order to retain his only source of power and popularity.

Who then are Mr. Baldwin's out and out friends, after he has discarded the "Moderates."

There is one fact no person will deny, that every Republican, in both the Canadas, is of the number. But, perhaps, the question more to the point would be,—“how many there really are, who are out and out supporters of Mr. Baldwin, who do not *conscientiously wish that Canada was a State of the Union to-morrow?*”

When Mr. Baldwin had to retire from Toronto, I had *not* promised him my support. I had gone no further than to say, that *no one whom I could influence would go against Lord Sydenham*, whose Solicitor-General he then was.

On Mr. Baldwin being driven from this city, I agreed to come forward, to prevent the incalculable injury to the Province, of the triumph of the enemies of responsible government; and my success was the greater triumph to Lord Sydenham *and the principle*, from my having no personal qualifications to pretend to.

Out of the dreadful crisis on the eve of which the Province of Canada seemed at that time, we had to extricate ourselves or perish; and I availed of the support of Mr. Baldwin and his particular friends, as a benighted traveller would avail of the only horses that could carry him beyond his present danger; the risk he ran, that being *RUNAWAYS*, they might carry him farther than he desired, had for the moment and in the circumstances, to be disregarded.

Apologising for the length of this explanation, which I consider due to myself,

I am, dear Sirs,

Your obedient, humble Servant,

ISAAC BUCHANAN.

---

## LETTER II.

To the Editor of the British Colonist.

TORONTO, 27th December, 1843.

SIR,—In taking up Mr. Hincks' letter, published in the *British Colonist* of yesterday, I am as happy as surprised, to be able in the present instance to praise that gentleman's "moderation" of language; and every one who has witnessed his political career, must observe the marked difference between the tone and manner of his present letter, and his former writings and political conduct.

The "language" is, however, a secondary consideration, and, as the public is aware, it is "MODERATE OR BRITISH OBJECTS" that I have always aimed at and still aim at getting established in the colony.

If I were to judge by Mr. Hincks' not answering my remarks, on his or Mr. Baldwin's character, I might suppose them *unanswerable*.

He changes the ground to *my* character, which as I am not a candidate for public trust, the public are in no way concerned about at present.

I may, however, shortly remark, that since my late return to the colony (after an absence of two years in England) I have changed my opinion greatly of Mr. Baldwin's safety, as a proper person to be entrusted with the power and patronage of the Province.

The political objects I have in view are exactly the same as they always have been, but I now feel satisfied that these can be *carried into*

*effect* sooner and better by men, who with views as liberal as Mr. Baldwin's and mine, are without any *doubts attaching* to their characters as British subjects, and can therefore introduce the greatest practical amount of liberalism (greater perhaps than would suit England) into their Legislative and Executive acts, without suspicion.

I have also the greatest objections to Mr. Baldwin's *misrepresentation* of Sir Charles Metcalfe's real views on Responsible Government; his Excellency being, as I am aware, quite willing to afford the privilege of giving their advice on every act of the Colonial Government, to men in whom his Excellency can repose entire confidence.

My other objections to Mr. Baldwin, as a party man, I shall go on to explain by and by.

In the mean time I shall dismiss the consideration of my own character, with the hope, that in my loss of all confidence in Mr. Baldwin's party character, I may be allowed to quote the manly sentiment put into General Jackson's mouth, when rebuking Major Downing's fear of his *appearing* inconsistent in the eyes of public opinion—"I am an honest man, Major, and I aint a'feard to change my opinion." For no man need to fear the charge of inconsistency, whose motives cannot be impugned, and whose offences have been only against factions and parties, and not against the laws of his country or the foundations of society.

All that I can possibly be blamed for is, that the keenness of my devotion to Responsible Government may have led me to co-operate with bad men or bad subjects, to accomplish what in loyal hands would surely be a good end, viz., *local self-government in matters purely provincial*.

The truly British portion of the population <sup>to whom</sup> it is my highest pride and glory to be *nationally* connected, are always in advance in the triumphs of liberty.

In this case my countrymen, the Scottish settlers, have wished to err as usual on the right side in doing too much rather than too little, for the principles of their native country; but we never for a moment shut our eyes to the danger that the horses we unwillingly had, were *RUNAWAY HORSES!* and that we might *possibly*, "avoiding Scylla fall into Charybdis." And it has been to every honest and true-hearted Scotchman among us, a matter of the most anxious concern, lest in avoiding the open and menacing rocks of black Prelacy or High Church Bigotry, we should suddenly and against *our inclinations* and true interest, get whirled into the more hidden and deceitful, but no less irreligious and dangerous gulph of Revolutionary Republicanism that *we saw* yawning to embrace us.

My present explanations are made under a sense of duty to my fellow-countrymen; and I have the satisfaction to feel the complete absence of all personal animosities. In fact it gives me pleasure to declare my admiration of Mr. Hincks' great practical talents, and to state that I believe there are few men so fit for the mere *office-work* of the Inspector General.

It is also fair to admit, that in Mr. Baldwin's measures, or more properly in his *legislation* (for it is important to distinguish Legislative from Executive acts), I consider there was little which, *if it came from an undoubted quarter*, would be very unacceptable to the public mind of Upper Canada. Mr. Baldwin, however, must be equally fair, and allow

on his part, that the mere talent of a Legislative act, or even the safety of a particular principle involved in a particular measure, does not necessarily form any guarantee to the colonists of the loyal or disloyal public or national principles of the legislator; otherwise we should be called on, contrary to the decision of our senses, TO TRUST THE LOYALTY (even though he should pretend to none) of the Hon. Daniel Webster, or any other great republican statesman whom I might import from the United States, for the purpose of adapting the machinery of our Colonial Legislature, or its working, to the circumstances of this colony, in the one feature that Canada has in common with the States, that it is a new country.

[MR. BALDWIN'S PARTY CHARACTER.]

My objection to Mr. Baldwin is, that, however good his own *personal intentions*, he cannot, in his situation, as a *party man*, avoid doing EXECUTIVE ACTS, which, I fear, would eventuate in revolution. Mr. Baldwin himself agrees with me in thinking that the more immediate cause of the late rebellion—at least its chief hope of success was, that the population had been alienated from the government, by seeing all the favours and patronage of the colony being heaped upon the extreme and bigoted High Church faction, though the mass of the people not only did not approve of, but were most strenuously opposed to the presumption of the Church of England.

The mass of the people, indeed, did not rebel—considering it very far from sufficient justification for breaking the laws of God and man and attacking the very foundations of society, that some bad taste was evinced in the upper stories of its fabric, in *this particular colony*. But the mass of the people of Upper Canada, as truly loyal, will assuredly rebel against the British Government, if it suffers Mr. Baldwin to weaken the very foundation of colonial society, by building it on a ground-work of disloyalty, or *doubted* loyalty. THE COLONISTS STANDING COOLY BY, AND SUFFERING THIS TO BE DONE, IS, INDEED, PRACTICALLY REBELLING against the British Government and against *British* principles.

Let me assure the people of this Province, that it is at this moment doing us the most incalculable injury in England, its being supposed that in Mr. Baldwin, a man of *doubtful* loyalty, our sentiments have a fair representation.

In England, I was appealed to on this subject, by men of *all* shades of politics, from the Tory to the Chartist. All were staggered at the apparent anomaly, and would not be satisfied. I told them that Mr. Baldwin's elevation was caused by the colonists' hatred of the High Church faction; but in this they could not discover cause sufficient for, as they expressed it, "allowing a loyal Province to be ruled by a disloyal faction." On the subject of Mr. Baldwin's past character, the question was again and again put to me in England, did he not prefer his party to his country, at the late rebellion, declining to fight against the former, or to turn out in defence of the latter? I remember well the feeling remark of one gentleman of the most liberal *British* politics, and whose bosom beats as high as any man's for the cause of freedom—"Well, poor Mr. Baldwin may be a patriot, but he is not a Briton."

But, in requiring that the Executive Government of Canada should be placed in safe hands, in the hands of parties who, by their past conduct

have *proved* themselves the uncompromising supporters as well of the rights of the Crown as of the privileges of the people, as these are recognized and established under the British constitution, it is not at all necessary that I assert the individual disloyalty of Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Hincks, in order to prove that (influenced from without *as they are*), they are improper men to be entrusted with the power and patronage of the Government in a British Colony.

If my Lord John Russell lost (and his patriotism made his Lordship illing, for a time, to lose) the sweets of place and power, because a portion of his political allies had views and interests which were considered angierous to the public; because, in fact, his Lordship was in danger of eing "*run away with*" by his extreme supporters; and if against none of those, any charge could be made, of having individually bared his arm against his country, or of having refused to lift it up to defend his country against internal or external foes, why should Mr. Baldwin complain, if, more deserving it, he should share the fate of that great statesman, in being turned out of office? I answer, fearlessly, that this arises from a cause which I am truly sorry to discover in Mr. Baldwin's character, viz., as total a want of practical patriotism as of every other manly practical quality of a statesman. Does Lord John Russell bear such allegiance to *his* party, that he would convulse his country to keep it in power, *though no great principle was at stake*?

Of Mr. Baldwin's private feelings, I should wish to say nothing—or nothing offensive; but knowing the *utter absence* of all fairness and generosity among his more immediate friends, I am quite aware of the fact, that I shall be most foully *misrepresented in my motives*, for exposing even his public character. My sense of duty to the public has, however, this assurance in overcoming my private feelings on the occasion of this explanation, that I know that I speak not only to a just but to a loyal public; and that I know how exceedingly few and insignificant Mr. Baldwin's out and out supporters in Upper Canada *really are*, and how little the public have confidence in what they say or do, since most of them either rebelled against, or declined defending the Government in 1837. I have come forward, therefore, to *tell the truth about Mr. Baldwin's true and unvarnished position as a public man, or rather as a party man*. To the honour of the former name, his character *practically* does not aspire. It may be said, indeed, that "his character belongs to British America," in one sense. This, however, cannot be said in the sense of his being a fair representation of the principles and spirit of her Majesty's trans-Atlantic subjects, but merely because his name will be recorded in history as—

*"The mere accident of an accident!"*

That accident, has been nearly as fatal to Canada as to the Old Colonies, viz., the opposition to the *British* principle of Responsible Government, of the former Governing or High Church party, in all the old and present North American Colonies.

We *love* the British Government, not only because it is *British*, but because it is the freest and *best* government on earth; not only because thinking so, our fathers fought and died to sustain its philanthropic principles, but because we, their sons, are prepared to do so, too, whether we find them openly assailed in the field, or betrayed by the Judas kiss of the colonial republican.

What I say will, I feel, awaken a long silent echo in the breast of every loyal man in the Province, and in the conscience of every disloyal one. My tone of confidence arises out of my perfect knowledge, that in the ranks of MY BROTHER REFORMERS OF UPPER CANADA, to whom I wish more particularly to appeal, the former, or Loyalists, are, at this day, to the latter, or Republicans, in just the same proportion as in 1837, viz., as a *host* to one man !

The greatest evils have arisen from Republicans having taken the sacred name of Reform in vain. Let Reformers see that this be no longer permitted.

LET US DESERVE THE CONFIDENCE of the Governor-General and her Majesty's Government, by evincing, at this critical period, unbounded confidence in their declarations of the beneficent intentions of the British Government to her colonies, but especially to the most noble of these, the Canadas. Let Upper Canada rear itself like a giant in his strength, to the protection of its every peculiar feeling and real interest. In rallying round his Excellency, we rally round every thing that is dear to us as Britons, or as colonists ; for we secure British connexion, we secure Responsible Government, and we will secure the immediate opening of King's College to all Christian bodies.

It is under British monarchical institutions alone that liberty is protected at once from tyranny and licentiousness. If that vital object could be better attained by other than British systems, we, on British principles, must be willing gladly to change them ; for *it is not the name, but the realities of liberty*, (of which the British systems are but the instruments, not the embodiment,) that we are enamoured of.

The Upper Canadian people, says Sir Charles Metcalfe, must have their interests protected, and their British feelings paid the deference they are surely entitled to in a British Colony.

The constitutional instrument of attaining these is a most important, but yet a secondary consideration to the practical enjoyment of the things themselves.

The quickest means to the promotion of our interests, Reformers may depend, is to be found IN GETTING OURSELVES AND OUR SENTIMENTS RESPECTED BOTH IN ENGLAND AND IN THE COLONY.

And it appears self-evident, that if we continue to support Mr. Baldwin as our representative in the Government, we cannot complain if the loyalty of Upper Canada remains a matter of dispute.

Now, you will bear me out in saying that *it was not a Reform party, but a Radical-Republican faction*, that in 1837 bared its arm against the British Government.

As a direct proof that Mr. Baldwin's connection and influence is with the faction and not with the party, I would also confidently appeal to the experience of all loyal Reformers, whether they could help feeling, that they individually *had not the slightest representation in or influence with the late Executive*, and that in fact (as constituted) it was just an obstruction to their claim on His Excellency's attention directly. And have not the great body of the Reformers felt, that Mr. Baldwin reserved all his confidence, favour and patronage, for men of doubtful loyalty to the

greatest extent he could, without outraging (more than would be good policy at first) the British prejudices, as they term the loyalty of Upper Canada.

On this point, however, as on every other, (these "Friends of the People!") Mr. Baldwin and his party, make the most barefaced misrepresentations to the people; and they go so far as to insist on Reformers, contrary to the convictions of their own feelings and memory, that it was for Mr. Baldwin, personally, that they fought and triumphed in the Upper Canada elections of 1841. Here, again, and without wishing to depreciate the assistance of Mr. Baldwin and his friends, I appeal with confidence to the great body of the Reformers, to bear me out in totally denying this bold assertion.

It was for that greatest friend of Upper Canada, Lord Sydenham, and for Responsible Government, that the Reformers then fought the Family Compact and High Church Tories of the Province. It was Lord Sydenham's object, as it is still THE INTEREST OF THE PROVINCE politically to extirpate the hated influence of the High Church Oligarchy root and branch.

It on the contrary, has always been and *is now*, (see *Examiner* of 13th December) Mr. Baldwin's object, because the INTEREST OF HIS PARTY (while they make noise enough about the *particular injuries* of the Compact to the public) to perpetuate the existence of this exclusive, and therefore necessarily unpopular faction, as the political stock in trade of Mr. Baldwin and his party.

Lord Sydenham had the interest of the Province at heart, and therefore Reformers fought for His Excellency; but Mr. Baldwin's sympathies extend only to *his party*, and therefore we did not formerly and will not *now* fight for him, he may rest assured. In fact, it was for the sake of his patron, Lord Sydenham, that I (in common with the country) originally tried to think the very best of Mr. Baldwin; and, regarding him as the great apostle of Responsible Government, I have (till I saw my error and found out that Mr. Baldwin *has not soul enough to distinguish between party and public objects*) continued to befriend and defend his character, in the hour of his need. Still willing to believe him, if not the high-minded, at least the true and disinterested advocate of Responsible Government—a principle so dear to my heart—I tried to excuse to myself and others, his too often repeated "*impracticability*," on the ground of the extraordinary circumstances in which he has so often been placed, or placed himself. As the friend of my principles, I, in fact, (nevertheless his evident halting,) gave him all the support I conscientiously could; for I have no sympathy with that pseudo liberality, or contradiction, which makes people pray to be enabled to forgive their enemies the greatest offences, when they *will not* forgive their friends the smallest difference of opinion.

To co-operate with the merciful Government of our Sovereign, we agreed *unhesitatingly* to co-operate with Mr. Baldwin, in promoting an oblivion, of the political offences which *his friends* committed in 1837, but since he chooses to take them again to his bosom, while they boast that they have not changed, *we may well be pardoned*, if we would rather be excused the same honour, by remaining his political friends, especially, as we have every reason to fear, that on us may boil over some portion of the Province's indignation, when, one of those days—and it will be as

soon as he can—he advises the elevation to the highest Colonial trust, of Doctor Rolph, or some other GREAT UNHANGED, for no reason that we can think of, unless it be that *he is not so much more guilty than Mr. Baldwin himself.*

Now-a-days, it does not seem at all necessary to a gentleman's having his "conscience void of offence towards God" that he should KEEP God's LAWS, and keep his conscience void of offence towards man; nor having violated the greatest of those laws and offended his fellow-man to an extent limited by his ability only, and not by his malice, does it seem at all required that he must exercise a modest repentance, and not glory in his crime. I would not be unjust, but I cannot draw any other inference than that with some people the late Rebellion is not viewed, *nor would another Rebellion be viewed*, in the light of a crime at all!

To show the glaring injustice of which Mr. Baldwin has been guilty, and that his entire efforts have been directed to elevate the rebel and to insult the loyalist, we have only to take a superficial glance at his late conduct. He persuades us to forgive, and try to forget that his friends united to cut our throats in 1837; and we do this the more readily, because we find it necessary to adopt one course in dealing with the political offenders of both provinces, and have therefore to grant to the Upper Canadian rebel, the benefit of the palliation which really did not exist but in the foreign national origin as well as grosser misgovernment of Lower Canada. Since great offences have been pardoned, the MODERATES and other Loyalists in the Provinces, (not excepting even the Family Compact,) might have surely expected an oblivion of their comparatively insignificant delinquencies, which, at worst, were but offences against party and faction, and not against the laws of our country, or the very foundations of society. If Mr. Baldwin, *as a Loyalist, could not view* these smaller matters as at worst but the errors of a friend, he should at least have had the policy, if he had not the delicacy to remember, that *other Loyalists* viewed them in that light.

And since Mr. Baldwin, and his organ, the *Examiner*, choose to continue to recall the long past errors of Loyalists as their STOCK POLITICAL IN TRADE, they cannot justly complain if, in self-defence, Loyalists appeal to their own weapons, and resuscitate a *few* of the ghosts of the rebellion, to make *them* tremble personally to an extent that they will take care to hide from public gaze.

But Mr. Baldwin, and his friends, carry their malignity so far as not to spare even the obvious truth from violation, any more than the feelings of the living or the memory of the dead.

Though keenly alive to the notorious fact of Mr. Baldwin's servility in allowing the *sweets of place* (for he could not latterly say of power,) to induce him to remain in the Executive Council for many months, every day of which he felt the cause of *responsibility to the people* grossly insulted, in his person,—Mr. Baldwin, and his organ, continue to violate the truth, by trying to gull the public into the belief, not only that he is the best advocate of the people's rights, and the most worthy and impartial adviser in dispensing the patronage of the Crown, but that any one who dares to be independent of him and his immediate followers, is no friend of the people!

To be capable of *respect to the people*, it is held up as the best preparation that, a man should *first* lay aside all respect for himself, as we shall see Mr. Baldwin has done, through *criminal devotion to party*.

It is not at all to the point that it be argued in favour of Mr. Baldwin, that he *personally* has in his *circumstances*, no need to covet the sweets of office, for if *he* is not *hungry*, the same could not I believe, be said of the most of his colleagues; and at any rate, it is evident that the independence of his purse had not communicated itself to his mind, as has been evinced by his servility to Sir Charles Metcalfe!

I do not however, at present, discuss Mr. Baldwin's *private* character, or my private feelings would of course lead me to grant him the greatest possible indulgence.

Mr. Baldwin, himself, be it remarked, takes every occasion to insist *publicly* on his being considered "A STRONG PARTY MAN," and is therefore fairly responsible for the principle and acts of HIS PARTY and ITS ORGANS, till he chooses to repudiate them. Whatever he, (under a feeling of conscious inability) might feel inclined to do, his party, it is quite evident, *will not rest* contented with what they call "Mr. Baldwin's principles," being in operation in the government. HE must be in the Executive bodily, or THEY and the influence of their ultra, if not Republican views cannot be got *forced back* into the councils of the colony; so that while *pretending* to fight for Mr. Baldwin personally and his character, the *Examiner* is, in fact, fighting for the whole presentable embodiment, the beginning and the ending of the influence and character of the Radical faction of Upper Canada; for in Mr. Baldwin centres all its influence and character, and in Mr. Hincks begins and ends all its practical talent.

Let us then, in the first place, take a sample of how the late Executive treat their late friends the advocates of Responsible Government. (See *Examiner* of 13th December.) "*Honest men of Kent*, look out! Harrison has sold himself, and is trying to buy you, send him back empty. Return an *honest Reformer*, or return an *honest Tory*,—not a truckling rejected mongrel,—tell him to go back to his master. Put his gold in his sack and send that back too. Your votes must be purchased by another price."

It will be clear to the public that Mr. Harrison's *dishonesty*, in Mr. Baldwin's pure sight, is just that he *should dare* to part company with Mr. Baldwin, even although Mr. Harrison thinks Sir Charles Metcalfe right, and Mr. Baldwin wrong!

Sir Charles Metcalfe too has been "*dishonest*" enough to loose confidence in Mr. Baldwin! and *the moment* His Excellency *dares* to do this, he at once descends not indeed in their minds, but in THEIR MOUTHS, from being "the ablest man, without exception, that ever held the destinies of Canada"—to be "a man who has studied the genius of the British Constitution, and imbibed his notions of the liberties and rights of a free people among the palanquin bearers of the East, or the woolly-headed negroes of the Sugar Islands." (See *Examiner* of 13th December.)

Now, Reformers, ask yourselves what horrible crime this Caitiff of a Governor-General has committed? The reply *as usual*, must be, that His Excellency, though he has done nothing against the country, has put his foot on Mr. Baldwin's party! and declines ever again to sit in the

Council with a man, who notoriously prefers on every occasion, *his party's* to his country's interest.

In fact, the head and front of Sir Charles Metcalfe's offending is, that *he will not forget* his solemn oath of office, but in fulfilment of its obligations, insists on continuing to think for his Sovereign and for her Province, and is known to doubt whether, (now that all questions on *principles of government* are at rest and will not affect the elections,) new elections in Upper Canada would return a majority of members who will be bold enough to say, that of its interests and feelings and loyalty, Mr. Baldwin is a proper representative.

The difference between the views of the Governor-General and those of Mr. Baldwin is, that His Excellency views any *party* but as a means for the purpose of governing; while Mr. Baldwin would practically degenerate government into a mere means or reward for the purpose of *party*.

The Reformers of Upper Canada will, however, agree with me that Sir Charles Metcalfe's is the English, and Mr. Baldwin's the American way of it.

That honest Reformer, Thomas Parke too, (now the Surveyor General) had the wrath of Mr. Baldwin and the *Radical Clique* poured out on his devoted head in 1841, for *daring* to judge for himself, and stick by Lord Sydenham, whom he had pledged himself to his constituents to support in getting Responsible Government *practically introduced into the Province*; yet the Reformers of the Province have actually exercised a greater influence through this gentleman's being in an office of detail, (even though not in the Cabinet,) than they have enjoyed through the more noisy and less true and practical *Reformers*, the late Executive, though they had so much more in their power.

The independent Members of the Assembly at that crisis, among whom I had the honour to be, saved Mr. Parke and the Province's best interest, *the cause of Reform*, by PUBLICLY ADDRESSING MR. PARKE'S CONSTITUENCY, the electors for Middlesex, exposing the *sacrifice of the public good for party objects*, which Mr. Hincks and Mr. Baldwin wished to effect. I give the document below, which will speak for itself.

In its list of names may be found a very fair nucleus for what the *Examiner* affects to sneer at, as a "moderate party," though the list is by no means an indication of *all* who, (if on the spot, and had circumstances permitted,) would have been glad to have joined in this declaration their independence of Mr. Baldwin.

If Mr. Hincks was then truly honest in *denouncing* Mr. Parke, his own *honest* indignation must have been the source of no small annoyance to Mr. Hincks, when he himself within a few short weeks thereafter, paid what I allow to be a just tribute to Lord Sydenham's Administration, by also joining Mr. Harrison, and deserting the "impracticable" Mr. Baldwin!

It is one of those realities which surpass fiction (as surpassing imagination,) that Mr. Baldwin should have the effrontery *now* to hold up Mr. Hincks, and Mr. Hincks Mr. Baldwin, to the public as paragons of political perfection, when we remember how at the time of this alienation of theirs, Mr. Baldwin denounced Mr. Hincks as a man of no "principle," and Mr. Hincks (who had the proof in his hand) denounced Mr. Baldwin as a man of no "practice," whose vanity (to save him from political insignificance) had sold him and Upper Canada to the Lower Canadians!

We do not require to plead against them, their notorious and deserved want of the confidence of Upper Canada. We need *only* appeal to their equally real, and nearly as notorious want of confidence in themselves.

---

TO THE REFORMERS OF THE COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX.

---

GENTLEMEN,—We have this day read, with pain and astonishment, in the columns of the *Examiner*, a letter addressed to you by Francis Hincks, Esq., the proprietor of that journal, and a member of the House of Assembly, recommending you not to countenance Mr. Parke, should he again appeal to you for your suffrages, and asserting that “*he, Mr. Parke, HAD DESERTED HIS PARTY and his principles—that he has lent his assistance to accomplish the views of a corrupt Government, and that if he be sent back to Parliament the consequences will be most injurious.*”

In giving publicity to charges of so serious and extraordinary a nature, Mr. Hincks may have been actuated by the most pure and patriotic feelings, and it would not become us to call in question his motives; but, gentlemen, we have a peculiar pleasure in stating, that although Mr. Parke may have lost the good opinion of Mr. Hincks, our confidence in him remains unshaken. We have long known him, and in and out of Parliament we have ever found him the firm and unbending advocate of the rights and liberties of the people. During the darkest period of this country's history, you had in him an uncompromising and faithful friend—and on a recent occasion you gave undoubted evidence of the estimation in which you held his character and his services. Will you abandon such a man at the presumptuous recommendation of any individual? We cannot believe that you will. Mr. Parke is at this hour what he has always been—an honest and consistent Reformer; there has been, on his part, no abandonment of principle; and we feel assured that the great body of Reformers hailed with delight his appointment to office, under an administration which has this day conceded, by its officers in the House of Assembly, the vital question of Responsible Government—a question for which no man in Canada contended more zealously, ably and unceasingly than Mr. Parke.

A sense of justice to an upright, intelligent and deserving man, must be received by you as our apology for thus obtruding ourselves on your notice—and we fondly entertain the hope, that by an overwhelming majority you will re-elect him to serve you in Parliament.

We are, Gentlemen,

Your most obedient Servants,

DAVID THORBURN, M. P. P.  
MALCOLM CAMERON, M. P. P.  
ELMES STEELE, M. P. P.  
JOHN ROBLIN, M. P. P.  
GEORGE BOSWELL, M. P. P.  
S. CRANE, M. P. P.  
J. W. POWELL, M. P. P.

ISAAC BUCHANAN, M. P. P.  
JOHN COOK, M. P. P.  
JAMES MORRIS, M. P. P.  
D. THOMPSON, M. P. P.  
JOHN GILCHRIST, M. P. P.  
J. WILLIAMS, M. P. P.  
HARMANUS SMITH, M. P. P.  
D. McDONALD, M. P. P.

Kingston, 18th June, 1841.

I would now allude to Mr. Baldwin's neglect of the interests and feelings of Upper Canada, in the unjust because unequal principle of the Assessment Bill, as well as in the want of all principle (I had almost said of all decency), in his permitting night after night, in Parliament, the acts of that friend of Upper Canada, Lord Sydenham, to be traduced, and his Lordship's memory vilified.

“ Though low his head be laid  
 Who brought THEE from thy native shade,  
 And gave thee SECOND birth;  
 Gave thee the sweets of power and place—  
 The tufted robe, the gilded mace,  
 And reared thy PUNY WORTH.”

Then again, to satisfy us how incapable Mr. Baldwin was of even the passive quality of *not exciting the disgust* of Upper Canada, let us ask ourselves whether the British feeling of its population could have any sympathy or even toleration for his mawkish liberality, which led him while all the while neglecting every well-known feeling of Upper Canada, to dignify every prejudice of Lower Canada with the name of *feeling*, and to practise a most ruinously liberal principle, in apportioning to the payment of the administration of justice in the Province, the local resources of the particular districts of Upper Canada—a principle of senseless liberality, which no representative of the interests of Lower Canada will ever be found mad enough to reciprocate, and which system of profligate waste, Mr. Baldwin would be the last man to apply to his own interests.

This was a tax, bearing only on Upper Canada, wished to be laid directly on the districts, by the authority of Mr. Hincks' Assessment Bill; although the late Executive most jesuitically pretended, that this was a measure of *itself imposing no tax*, but merely enabling the districts to tax themselves for their local improvement.

Grateful to Mon. Morin for that great feat of moral courage, his introducing into his School Bill, our Upper Canadian principle of local assessment hitherto unknown in Lower Canada, the country would have been contented to wait till the representatives of public opinion in Lower Canada indicated that, a farther step in what they and we know to be the *right road*, would be popular in Lower Canada; but till such time it would have been considered *no more than equal justice to Upper Canada*, to insist on the expense of the administration of justice in this section of the Province, and every other item which a want of the principle of local assessment in Lower Canada, made a direct charge on the Provincial Treasury, ought also to have been *taken off the Districts of Upper Canada, and paid from the same public source*; and by Mr. Baldwin not doing so, the population of Upper Canada had their most vital interests most *glaringly sacrificed* by him.

Let us now consider the more immediate cause of the withdrawal from Mr. Baldwin, of the confidence and support of the Moderate party. Let it not be forgotten that they were in the first place *spurned as MODERATES*, through the medium of his own organ, the *Examiner*. They leave him, *not because he is*, but *because he is not* the true friend of Responsible Government, because, in fact, they find that though he holds the theory,

he is, from some unexplained cause, incapable of the practice of Responsible Government. This they cannot conceive to arise wholly from mere inability, and they are therefore left to conclude, that if not in his mind, at least in the minds of those who constitute *his pressure from without*, there is an *ulterior* object, which takes precedency of the principle of Responsibility to the people *under Monarchical institutions*. The loyal Reformers, in forming this opinion, do not judge merely from the evident wish of Mr. Baldwin and his extreme supporters, to perpetuate in the continued existence of the Family or High Church Compact, a corruption of which they, as a party, may continue to be, as they have always been, the maggots or evidences to the Canadian public, and with which by keeping up an endless and most offensive irritation, they may disgust the British public to an extent which will result in the Republican's heart's wish, viz: the discarding of Canada by England altogether! They appeal to the incontrovertible fact, that, for many months Mr. Baldwin has been the irresponsible minister of Sir Charles Metcalfe's WILL! while he has all the while had the duplicity to pretend to the public that he continued to be the responsible minister of the *wishes of an enfranchised people*.

By doing as he has done, Mr. Baldwin *has been a traitor* to what he agrees with us to be *true and unequivocal* responsibility to the colonists. He has done all that he could to overthrow our constitutional rights and privileges, which, the operation of Responsible Government, if not a delusion, ought to be the acknowledged legitimate means of securing not only to ourselves, but of handing down unimpaired to our posterity, as their most valuable and valued birthright,—the chartered embodiment, in fact, of all our rights and liberties as colonists.

I think it no more than fair to admit that *Sir Charles Metcalfe erred in not publicly dismissing Mr. Baldwin, when His Excellency was prepared no longer to consult him on every matter*. This assuredly (as the constitutional course,) would naturally have been the course, which a Statesman of the tried and universally acknowledged talent and liberality of the present Governor-General, would have adopted, under the circumstances, had his Excellency taken the proper view of it. His Excellency's recent arrival amongst us ought, however, to be considered; and before rashly condemning the Governor-General in this particular instance, the fact will be borne in mind, that His Excellency must have felt that, as a constitutional Governor, he must depend for his ability to change his advisers, on the support of public opinion, which at the time he found sunk in exhaustion, from the effects of a long course of wretched political excitement in the province. Public opinion had, in fact under Sir Charles Bagot, given no indication but that it was the play thing of faction! Sir Charles Metcalfe found that he could only triumph by letting the BRITISH LION OR PUBLIC OPINION get gradually awake to the *weak* hands that held him. And even if we allow that there is yet something to be said *against* Sir Charles's course in *other* and less extraordinary circumstances of the province, there is much in its present circumstances to say in defence of his wisdom.

If it were necessary farther to defend Sir Charles Metcalfe, we might just remark how good his Excellency's right was to suppose that, Mr. Baldwin should know so much better than his Excellency, a stranger, had the means of knowing, what the people he represented in the council of the colony expected of him, viz: that he should retire the moment the Governor-General showed a want of confidence in him personally, by

denying him the privilege of advising, or by asking advice and not following it,—His Excellency conceiving that the honor of the crown and the interests of the people required that he should pronounce a different decision from that which Mr. Baldwin had recommended. Mr. Baldwin ought not for a day to have given the Council the sanction of his name after he was aware that there were acts performed by the government in the Colony to which he was not privy.

It is no palliation to the crime of A MAN WHO TAKES UPON HIMSELF THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE HIGHEST COLONIAL TRUST, that he has been only a tool in abler hands.

This excuse is just what we might anticipate being made for him, when encroachments by Republicanism, on the constitution of the colony came to be found out, as they assuredly would, were the Government again entrusted to hands so weak.

Even Mr. Baldwin's warmest private friends do not approve of his political course and conduct; and when they defend him, they forget their higher duty to themselves, to reform, and to their country. They can only defend his motives by a too amiable partiality, at the expense of his judgment and his intellect.

Mr. Baldwin never can satisfactorily account to the public for his infatuation; but, unfortunately, its prejudicial effects on our liberties and interests will long outlive the temporary question of whether its cause was to be found in its own infirmity of purpose or in the malignity of his party.

The Reformers of Upper Canada must be now satisfied of what they have long feared, that Mr. Baldwin is not a safe man to be in the government of any British colony. This is the inevitable conclusion they must arrive at, whether they regard Mr. Baldwin's own course of conduct and want of all management in the past, or scrutinise the characters of those who influence him, which we will find, with few exceptions, extreme, or Republican, and conscientiously so, no doubt.

The Reformers are the parties chiefly deceived in Mr. Baldwin, as, having trusted him most; and, as the most sternly upright guardians of the public liberties and interests of Upper Canada, they will take care never again to be deceived into allowing their kindly, or mere private feelings, to place them in hands evidently shown to be not only incapable, but positively dangerous, be the cause what it may.

But people at a distance can scarcely conceive it possible, that Mr. Baldwin's personal popularity could be so overrated as it has been; though parties here can understand it, when they remember the great exertions made by the *Examiner* newspaper to write up his then passive qualities against the tried or positive political vices of John, by Divine permission, President of the Executive Council, formerly! &c. &c., when that newspaper had the benefit of Mr. Hincks' great talent, as editor. At all events, there no longer remains any doubt how exceedingly small Mr. Baldwin's popularity is, when we try to think what one constituency in Upper Canada he could go to, and be quite sure of his return without great difficulty. And yet in Mr. Baldwin's person is centred nearly the whole influence of that presumptuous faction, which but yesterday, on the false pretence of representing Upper Canada, monopolised all the power and patronage of the province, till interfered with by Sir Charles Metcalfe, who, seeing that

they were constantly occupied with party purposes, and appeared to care little or nothing for the interests of the country, began to doubt their true title to represent it in the Executive; and his Excellency soon became aware they personally never had the confidence or support of the Upper Canadians, except as *instruments* to keep in check the other extreme party in the politics of Upper Canada.

#### [THE FAMILY COMPACT.]

This High Church faction's exclusiveness and intolerance was, in fact, the origin and its existence forms the only tenure of the little popular influence Mr. Baldwin has enjoyed. They opposed the introduction of Responsible Government into the colony, and till this *question of principle* was set at rest, the population had nothing for it but to support its advocate, Mr. Baldwin, however little confidence they had in him otherwise, I have never, therefore, viewed the decision of public opinion in favour of him, as much more than an indication of the Compact's greater unpopularity.

The influence of this High Church faction on the Province has been most blighting. Its opposition to every thing popular, *forcing* the people into the arms of such men as Mr. Baldwin and his friends, were proof enough of this. The startling want of political talents in the colony speaks loudly of the mismanagement of its educational funds, and shows how injuriously on the encouragement of our colonial youth, the old system has operated, which made the narrow door of Church Toryism the only road to possible preferment in professional life.

It seems to me to speak well for the virtue of the country, that its youth should have preferred the humbler walks of industry, to educating themselves for public life with such soul degradation attached to its prospects of advancement.

Under Responsible Government, however, the face of things will soon change for the better. King's College will immediately be open to all Christian bodies in the Province, and the gradual extirpation of Religious Bigotry and High Church Toryism will then have commenced.

To secure the new College Bill, the Reformers should pledge their representatives to co-operate with Sir Charles Metcalfe, and see that it be made the very first act of the first Session of Parliament.

I would rather see a dissolution of the Union with Lower Canada, (which would not, now that we have Responsible Government, be so great an evil as it would before have been), than allow the Lower Canadian Members to defeat us, as some say they will in *liberalizing* the College.

This colony cannot be retained an appendage of the British Government, if the insulting pretensions of the Church of England are not put a period to, by opening the College to all. These pretensions led mainly to the revolt of the old colonies: and if not put a stop to here, they will prove as fatal to the connection as the republican principles or practice of the other extreme faction.

Let the Province rise in its might, and by giving a generous support to the Governor-General, enable him to extirpate those two factions, which are and have long been a perfect nuisance and perpetual source of weakness to Upper Canada,—keeping it a scene of continual excitement,—a

political battle-field for party struggles, in which the people lose, let the battle terminate either way, for the great body of the electors never had any influence with either extreme faction beyond the election week!

[SIR CHARLES METCALFE.]

In most striking contrast to Mr. Baldwin's character, we see in the character of our present Governor-General the highest qualifications, all vieing for supremacy: the most practical talents, the most enlarged and liberal principles, and the greatest experience and firmness; and His Excellency's administration has this other most important advantage, that his character is most *implicitly trusted at Head-Quarters*. Indeed men of all shades of opinion and politics concurred, on Sir Charles Metcalfe's appointment, in heaping praises on Sir Robert Peel, (not Lord Stanley,) as having given the Canadian Government to a *decided Liberal* in preference to one of his own political party; because Sir Charles was considered by all, *the fittest man in England* for the state of things in Canada.

In Sir Charles Metcalfe's hands, the prospects of the Colony would therefore seem very bright, did we not know that the "*impracticable*" Lord Stanley is still at the Colonial Office. But we need not be much surprised, if Sir Robert Peel's insisting on responsibility to Canadian public opinion being *practised* to the fullest extent, *be made the excuse* for the retirement from office, of this last hope of our Provincial High Church faction; although the chief object of Lord Stanley's going out of the Ministry will be, to allow of the greatly to be desired liberal settlement of Irish grievances. I believe it is the nearly universal belief of this Colony, that Lord Stanley is, of all public men, Whig or Tory, the Statesman of the smallest judgment and temper, and greatest pretence on Colonial subjects, except Lord Brougham. Indeed to call Lord Stanley a *politician*, were very nearly as great an *excess of courtesy*, as to pay the same unmerited compliment to our friend, Mr. Baldwin! for (though as a matter of ability, it is, of course, comparing great things with small,) the public characters of the two have many points of similarity.

**BOTH ACTUALLY PRACTISE THE TRUE SPIRIT OF REPUBLICANISM**, carrying out their theories only, instead of carrying out the great national interests, whose well defined existence have given perhaps as much of their permanent character, to the British theories or principles, in which they originated, as its nominal cause, the Monarchy, while by making these, to a great extent, *matters of fact*, as contradistinguished from the *matters of opinion* of the American Government, allow also of their gradual change, to suit the changing circumstances or increased enlightenment of a country; and prevent the greater evil, of the great interest of a country coming to rebel against its principles, as will occur in America,—as well as preventing, in the character of the people, the slipperyness of the American character:

"Godward, a nice man;  
Manward, a *leettle* twistical—

And this has been evinced, so glaringly in Mr. Baldwin's career, that it seems as if his rescue from the waves of the rebellion, was permitted, that by following up, nothing daunted, American instead of British principles, he should by and by, commit **POLITICAL SUICIDE**, and be of use, as a warning to the people of the Province to avoid Republicanism; they

being made to see in him that error which they might have with difficulty come to feel in themselves.

FOR MR. BALDWIN'S LONG EQUIVOCAL PRACTICE HAS AT LENGTH BROKEN FORTH INTO OPEN REBELLION AGAINST HIS ALWAYS MORE THAN EQUIVOCAL PRINCIPLES, AND HIS SERVILE CONDUCT IN THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, HAS BETRAYED ALL HIS SOLEMN PROFESSIONS AT THE HUSTINGS, OF PURITY AND INDEPENDENCE, AND OF DEVOTION TO THE CAUSE OF HIS COUNTRY, IN PREFERENCE TO THE INTERESTS OF PARTY.

The English public have of course had Lord Stanley's oratory and his name to dazzle them : but Sir Robert Peel knows his Lordship as well as we know Mr. Baldwin, and trusts him only because the "moderate" MR. HOPE IS REALLY THE PRESIDING COLONIAL DEITY in Downing-street.

His Lordship is thus kept before the public as a Statesman, for *party purposes*, long after his impracticability, like Mr. Baldwin's, has not only been known and deplored by his political friends, and become so palpable as to disgust the public.

His Lordship, like Mr. Baldwin, was an apostle of the principle, but has repudiated the practice of Reform ; yet his Lordship is an honest man than Mr. Baldwin, for his Lordship does not even retain *the name of Reformer*.

In concluding this notice of her Majesty's present Secretary for the Colonies, I must not omit to state the additional fact, that his Lordship's mind is not made up any more than Mr. Baldwin's, whether or not it is *any great object* to preserve the connection between Canada and the Mother Country !

But I return to Sir Charles Metcalfe. I have tried, and I hope successfully, to counteract the general impression that his Excellency's "great difficulty" will be Lord Stanley ; for I know that the less any policy is supposed to be the dictation of his Lordship, the more likely it is to get a fair and unprejudiced consideration from the Colonists.

Immediately on his Excellency's arrival in Canada, Sir Charles Metcalfe, with a quiet and honest earnestness, turned to the vital subject of the anomalous position of our Colonial politics, the deep penetration and intuitive energy of his mighty intellect. His Excellency neither spouted magniloquence, like Sir Francis Bond Head, nor publicly reared *dummy* principles, like Mr. Baldwin, only to knock them down again for the amusement of the public. His Excellency's whole time and attention, he felt, in common with Lord Sydenham, belonged to his country's practical objects, not to any party *delusions* ; and to elevate Upper Canada, he found he must crush the anti-British parties that so long had cursed it. With admirable decision and boldness, his Excellency (conscious of their guilt and want of true patriotism) determined to bring *both* the usurping factions to the bar of public opinion. His Excellency determined to state publicly and plainly to Upper Canada, that the single policy or principle of his administration would be to get Responsible Government into full practical operation in both Provinces ; and Sir Charles Metcalfe now demands the co-operation, in this truly British object, of all men who are truly British at heart.

The process of his Excellency's mental argument, I can suppose to be something like the following :

How is it that such men as Lord Sydenham and the Honourable William Morris should have, in apparent contradiction of those principles of freedom in which their characters originated, and for which their lives have been so distinguished, *yielded* to the people, with an unwilling and trembling hand, this cup of bliss, this principle of Responsibility of the Colonial Executive to Colonial public opinion, which *they knew* to be the Colonists' constitutional birth-right, as British subjects ?

The reason is plain and obvious. Though they knew that the Lower Canadians are monarchical, they had reason, from the rebellion, to doubt whether the British Government had not criminally neglected the means of making them *British*; and though they knew that the Upper Canadians are truly British in feeling, they saw the difficulty of getting this brought out in the *Executive of United Canada*—at all events till the Lower Canadians could be got to act on their monarchical feelings, and attend to their true interests, as men and as Christians, by dismissing from their minds the idle fear of *British tyranny*, by getting convinced (as Mr. Viger and his friends already are) that though it might have been the interest and low-born glory of a Canadian faction or oligarchy, to oppress them and stigmatise their origin, in former times, the British Government could have had no interest in degrading the condition or wounding the feelings of her own Colonists.

Lord Sydenham and Mr. Morris, in their capacity of public men, impelled by no unworthy or baseless suspicions,—impressed on the contrary by the deepest regrets, must have concluded that there was not before their minds sufficient evidence that in Lower Canada the rebellion was only on the surface, and (as they fondly hoped) it had not pervaded the whole structure of its society. They saw that Upper Canada was indeed British, but then by considering well the under currents of Upper Canadian politics, they saw that the question of British Connection could not yet be made the one on which the *first* elections under the Union would turn.

They saw that the anti-British policy, if not principles of Sir Allan Macnab and the High Church faction, would as formerly lead them to prefer the interest of their Church to the interest of their country, and for the sake of the former to continue to be the curse of the latter by continuing to deny the great British and Constitutional principle called Responsible Government.

The question therefore, at the first elections of the Union must unfortunately continue to be the same exciting one which under one name or another, had always on every former occasion been the question at the hustings in Upper Canada, viz., "Responsibility to the Colonists;" and this ruinous perpetuation of *questions of principles of government*, must introduce many men into the Assembly, because the friends of this abstract principle (like Mr. Baldwin) who have not distinguished themselves as friends of the connection or of the British Government, and would lose their elections when "connection" comes to be the simple question at the hustings *under the full practical operation of responsibility in the government acquiesced in also by the whole people*, not excepting the High Church faction.

His Excellency also saw what Lord Sydenham and Mr. Morris must have seen clearly that as the Lower Canadian representatives would be at

first a comparatively compact body, while the Upper Canadian members would have no *oneness of purpose*, the result would be that French influence would characterise the councils of the colony.

The chief danger of this was not the members of Executive Council being mostly or being all Lower Canadians, *if it were only known that the objects of Lower Canada are British objects.*

The natural jealousy of the mere local interests of Upper Canada, we might have suppressed and complained only when our local interests came to be invaded ; but our British spirit must at once take fire at the supposition, that Upper Canada would yield her CHARACTER AS A BRITISH COLONY.

As far as the protection of the local interests of Lower Canada were concerned, there was no wish to administer through other than the truest representatives that could be found, of the true feelings and opinions of the Lower Canadians.

But there would be the *greatest* objection to these Lower Canadian Councillors, if themselves anti-British, they should be dishonest enough to insist on having as Upper Canadian colleagues, men of doubtful or republican tendencies, if on the same title as they themselves, the Lower Canadian Councillors, held office (their being a true expression of Lower Canada), these Upper Canada republicans were known not to be a true expression of the principles or feelings or interests of Upper Canada.

It was foreseen, that this unfortunate state of matters might occur, and yet the Councillors from Lower Canada be quite justifiable in taking Mr. Baldwin as their colleague from its being made to appear, that the majority from Upper Canada in Parliament approved of him, while the fact is, that the Upper Canadian majority have various times shown their total disapproval of Mr. Baldwin's conduct, and have rallied not for him personally, but *with him* for the principle of Responsible Government when in dispute.

The liberal members from Upper Canada know full well, that now that Responsible Government is fully granted, and the question at rest, they can neither satisfy their own minds, nor those of their constituents, with any good reason for thrusting Mr. Baldwin on Sir Charles Metcalfe, except that he is one of *Mon. Lafontaine's majority*. And why should Mon. Lafontaine desire to retain Mr. Baldwin as his colleague, since he notoriously does not represent the feelings of Upper Canada ? There is this excuse for Mon. Lafontaine, that though he knows this privately, he may not have been shown this clearly enough in a public manner, besides Mon. Lafontaine sits for what was, but is not now, Mr. Baldwin's pocket borough, the Fourth Riding of York.

On his own principles, Mon. Lafontaine cannot wish Upper Canada not to be represented, far less to be misrepresented in the Executive, and every one must allow that Upper Canada would be far better with a fair representation in the Executive without the *name* of Responsible Government, than as lately without a proper representation of its local interest and its British character and feelings, even though retaining the *name* !

Sir Charles Metcalfe, however, was too liberal a man to permit even the name of freedom to be lost or trampled on. Rather than depart from either the name or the reality of Responsible Government, the Union will be broken up.

Responsible Government, both in name and in reality (not to one Province only, but to both Provinces), is necessary to the preservation of the connection with England.

What confidence it must give us in the judgment, British feeling, and patriotism of our present Governor General, to find his decision fraught with such practical beneficence and liberality.

"I shall not," says Sir Charles Metcalfe, "stop to split straws of theory with Mr. Baldwin; but I am determined *practically* to do justice to Upper Canada, by getting her British principles properly represented in any Council that I consent to sit in."

Sir Charles Metcalfe has therefore dismissed his late Council, as the only means to preserve the Union of the Canadas. *As an Englishman* must have done, his Excellency felt that if, under the Union, the interests of Upper Canada cannot be got represented, and loyalty is not to characterize the government of the colony, the population of Upper Canada will demand a disunion forthwith, as the only means of preserving the connection with England, from the *united* designs of the Republicans of both Provinces.

Time is all that is required to bring the inhabitants of Lower Canada also to see the justice of giving to Upper Canada the same favour—a fair representation in the Executive, which Upper Canada does not deny to them; and perhaps the gaining of time might be part of his Excellency's reason for allowing Mr. Baldwin and his colleagues to remain so long in their degraded and mistrusted position in the Council.

In rallying for Sir Charles Metcalfe and British connection, I feel that we are rallying for ourselves. The *clouds* of misrepresentation which the late Executive set up, to withdraw the eyes of the public from themselves, and to cover their unwilling retreat from office, are now being dispelled by the truth.

The loyal population will take their stand by the Governor General, as one man; and as I feel that none are more loyal than my own loved countrymen, I know that to them our mountain cry will not be raised in vain, on this occasion,

*"Clann nan Gaidheil 'n gualibh a cheile."*

"Highlanders, shoulder to shoulder and back to back."

I am, Sir,

Your obedient humble servant,

ISAAC BUCHANAN.

## LETTER III.

To the Editor of the Toronto Mirror.

TORONTO, 6th January, 1844.

SIR,—No man can have more decided objections to anonymous writing than I myself have; and my answering your correspondent, "Honesty," arises solely from my perfect satisfaction, that in him I am addressing a person whom I greatly respect, that truly honest man, James Harvey Price, M.P.P. for the First Riding of York.

To the question—

"Could not Alwington House disclose a tale that would redound but little to your credit, as a man of independent mind and principle?"—

I answer, No—most unequivocally, No. Neither Sir Charles Metcalfe's nor Lord Sydenham's house *could tell any tale* of me, nor will the *narrow* house (where, at last, after all our squabbles, we shall all meet) be able to record my loss of *political independence*, if it does not, at the same time, record my loss of reason.

To the question—

"Has or has not a communication passed between yourself and Sir Charles Metcalfe, of a cringing and unprincipled character, on the one side, and of fulsome coaxing flattery on the other?"

I answer, No—Never. No influence but that of Mr. Baldwin's Republican partisans, could have induced me to cry off for ever from Mr. Baldwin.

I think, however, that I have to complain a little of Mr. Price, in putting questions whose answers he knew as well before as now; but I am willing to put all his errors to their true account, his morbid partiality for Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Price and all his friends knew, too, that their assistance in my election was no favour to me personally. In my election they had, but I had not, PERSONAL AND PARTY OBJECTS, apart from those of the great body of the Reformers of Upper Canada. My object and the object of the Reformers, was solely to do away that incubus on the young energies of the province—an irresponsible High Church Oligarchy.

In Lord Sydenham's time, the danger was too great to allow us to be particular about the *British* character of the candidate. In Sir F. B. Head's time, again, the Reformers missed it in not *peremptorily refusing* to vote for candidates who did not combine liberalism with loyalty.

Let us not do either of these things a second time. Let us avoid *matters of opinion* and come to *matters of fact*, to avoid all misunderstanding at the elections.

LET US, THEREFORE, AGREE IN CALLING A MAN LIBERAL, IF, BEING WILLING TO GIVE SIR CHARLES METCALFE A FAIR TRIAL, HE WILL INSIST ON HIS EXCELLENCY'S EXECUTIVE RETIRING, WHEN NOT ADVISED WITH US

EVERY MATTER; AND IF HE WILL STAND FOR THE UNIVERSITY BEING OPENED TO ALL CHRISTIAN BODIES. AND LET US MAKE LOYALTY ALSO, SO FAR A MATTER OF FACT—LET US SAY WE SHALL CONSIDER A MAN LOYAL WHO WOULD TURN OUT TO DEFEND THE GOVERNMENT, IN CASE OF A REBELLION OCCURRING TO-MORROW; AND PROOF OF THIS WE SHALL REQUIRE, IN HIS NOT HAVING DECLINED TO TURN OUT IN 1837.

This seems to me not at all *practically* different from the principle of the Secret Societies bill, which I admire, and will give the late Executive all credit for, if they will only act upon it in the case of Rebels, as well as in the case of Orangemen, excluding both, *as such*, from office.

Mr. Price is Mr. Baldwin's truest, if not his only true political friend, (and to him I would appeal with confidence as to the correctness of all I have said,) a straightforward honest Englishman, of unblemished private character, and whose chief fault as a public man, is the equivocal position which, in the troubles of 1837, he was led into by his personal friendship for Mr. Baldwin. The stain on this gentleman's character is nothing, when compared with that which follows Mr. Baldwin's as a shadow, paralyzing *his* every effort as a public man, and warning the country to look well to the *ulterior* object. But, although Mr. James Harvey Price was cruelly hurried on to the stage of public life, for Mr. Baldwin's purpose, without any personal object to constitute the *felt* guilt of a political crime; and although his errors have all the palliation of arising from a *want of fixed political principles*, rather than from having bad ones; yet on him must remain equally with Mr. Baldwin, the stain of the *political renegade from national virtue*, which no time can wash away.

Now that Responsible Government is no longer in dispute, Mr. Price, too, must see the expediency of withdrawing from political life, to save the cause of Reform from injury. He must leave the public cause of Reform to men, against whose loyalty there is not *the shadow of a doubt*, and who are known to combine *loyal* with *liberal* principles. This is—

The only art his guilt can cover  
To hide his shame from every eye.

But this I must say, in justice to Mr. Price, without fear of contradiction, that there is no man in the Province, around the weak point of whose otherwise excellent course it would be more grateful ~~for~~ his friends and the public to throw the mantle of oblivion; for a man like Mr. Price, who has sacrificed his own character on the altar of friendship, has surely the highest claim to our admiration, has indeed a far higher claim to the sympathy of a generous population, than could flow from what may turn out to be the character of the befriended.

If Mr. Baldwin had taken Mr. Price's *honest* counsel, and had not continued to sacrifice his country's to his *party's interests*, his political career might have numbered a year or two more. In such case, he would have left office, at least with clean hands. His political *apple-cart* would not have got upset for a little time longer.

— Time, indeed, was all that was necessary to satisfy the convictions of even his personal friends, that Mr. Baldwin has really no political ability, but in Mr. Price's hands, he would have retired to private life, not open to any charge of political dishonesty.

The most obvious INFATUATION, however, has been written on Mr. Baldwin's forehead, since the unfortunate period when, amid the feebleness of Sir Charles Bagot's last days, the possession of almost unlimited, and certainly most irresponsible power, coming into Mr. Baldwin's still more feeble hands, made him believe the shouts of friends more dishonest than Mr. Price, who sawningly suggested to his inordinate vanity *that by his own might he had come to all this power and glory!* It never seems for one moment to have occurred to Mr. Baldwin, that an injury and injustice to a people from their professed friend, (EVEN FOR THE SAKE OF PARTY,) is no less an evil to them, and is a greater moral as well as political crime, than the same act if done by a *professed* tyrant. There never was than Mr. Baldwin, a more lively illustration of the saying—

Quem Deus vult perdere.

Primum DEMENTAT.

For it may be more truly said of him than ever of public man, "He has no one to blame but himself,"—"He was indeed the instrument of his own destruction."

I am, Sir,

Your obedient, humble Servant,

ISAAC BUCHANAN.

## LETTER IV.

To George Brown, Esquire, Proprietor of the Banner.

TORONTO, 12th January, 1848.

SIR,—I must say that I do consider that you have committed a breach of your promise to me, voluntarily made on Saturday evening, but not of any *bargain*, for I had annexed no conditions to the publication, by you, of my letter.

Your first day of publication being Friday, I had not applied to you, out of delicacy, till I supposed that my doing so would in no way affect your course, which I knew must either be, to interfere in party politics, or not. I have been since told that you had formerly an article which *took part* with the ex-ministers; but I had not, and have not yet, seen such, if in existence. I would have considered it my duty to have repeated my warning to you, to *avoid getting involved with party*, except that this might have appeared as if I deprecated animadversion on myself, at present. I know, however, that you have yourselves alone to blame, for those other friends who induced you to come to Canada, kindly offered you the same advice, though you have preferred to confide in that of the ex-ministers' party, whose object with you you cannot misunderstand.

When I gave you the order to publish my letter, you stated that you intended to say nothing of my letter; but you gave no indication that *now* you would.

I remember of no such statement by you, as that "you utterly disagreed with the whole purport of the letter," nor did you enter, at any great length, as you insinuate, into your reasons for disagreeing with the "sentiments" expressed in it. You certainly expressed yourself to the effect, that you viewed my letter as injudicious; but I do not think your view went farther than that I was out in my expectations that other ministers could be found for Sir Charles Metcalfe, who would have the will and the power to carry out liberal measures.

You, however, distinctly stated that the *Banner* would not meddle in party politics, on which I expressed to you my happiness, and read you a letter I had just finished, to Mr. Fox Maule, in which I fondly anticipated that the constitutional stand of the friends, in Canada, of the Free Church of Scotland, would greatly help to disabuse the public mind in England, of its prejudices as to the political safety of the adherents of this, the institution of my heart. My letter to Mr. Maule stated that the friends of the Free Church of Scotland, would, both as a matter of inclination and of duty to the position of the Church at home, stand for three things.

1st. They will, at all times, stand up for the British Government, whatever is or may be the usage of them, or their Church, at home or in Canada.

2nd. That they would oppose republicanism, as practical infidelity both in religion and politics, whatever be the consequence.

3rd. That they would endeavour to promote, in the colony, the most liberal British politics.

Now, Sir, I think that I have some right to complain, that in the face of this you should have *taken part* against the Governor General, and with the ex-Ministers; knowing as you do, that between them and me there is no matter of constitutional principle, in discussion, and that my objection to Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Hincks is, that *they have not the confidence of Upper Canada*, and otherwise are unable to practise the principles we mutually profess.

I should be the very last to commit the enormous evil of infringing on the independence of the press, and for his Excellency's views on that subject, his being the Governor who gave liberty to the press in India, is, I should think, a sufficient guarantee.

I beg to remind you, however, that it was our admiration of your views on the subject of the *Free Church of Scotland*, and not politics, that led us to induce you to leave New York, and that we understood that the *Banner* was brought here to benefit not to injure or misrepresent the Presbyterians of Canada.

We understood that the *politics* of the *Banner* would extend no farther than the application of our Presbyterian views to constitutional principles together with such *news* as was necessary for the attraction of a general newspaper.

And, if the friends who brought you here agree with me, that you are inflicting a fatal wound on the Free Church of Scotland at home, and are *hurrying* its friends in Canada into a vortex of Republicanism, they will agree with me, that we are justified in separating ourselves from you in the public mind, that in fact, it would be most culpable in us not to do so,

and not to decline openly all association with the men of doubtful loyalty, with whom you would attempt to associate the Presbyterians of Canada.

I may be allowed a few remarks on your notice of my letter, though its *ignorance of the circumstances* and self-contradiction must do away its effects on most of your readers.

You assert that my "allegations or rather suspicions against these gentlemen, has reference to a time long since past," while you know that among other *recent* delinquencies, I accuse Mr. Baldwin of betraying the cause of Responsible Government, by continuing in the Council for the *last few months*, during which time he does not pretend to have been consulted in every matter.

Was this a long time past? Even if loyal men, this were sufficient objection surely to Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Hincks.

Your argument would almost seem to go the length, that proving them *not disaffected* is all that is wanted to prove them fit for Councillors of State.

You say "the disaffected have been converted into dutiful and loyal subjects," while every one knows that no Governor dare entrust to Mr. Baldwin or Mr. Hincks the giving out of arms in case of a rebellion, as they would doubtless give them to *THEIR PARTY*, who, to say the least of them, *would not use them* in favour of the Government.

You say that in office, they have shewn no trace of anti-British feeling. Was their pretending to express the public voice of Upper Canada, *while they knew well that they did not express it*, manly, honest, or British?

Was *devotion* to a faction, chiefly composed of men of at best but passive loyalty, any evidence of British feeling?

Do you mean to assert that British feeling *characterized* the late Executive? Do not bring forward as sufficient their *legislative* acts,—for the worst men may, *for a purpose*, introduce the best principle into a public measure of this sort.

You say "the country is not rebellious (so say I), for they chased the rebels out of it without the assistance of a single soldier."

Who do you mean by *they*? I wish to God that the names of Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Hincks, and all their more immediate friends, could be shewn me, on the list of the volunteers or militia who defended the Government and our lives and properties in 1837.

You assert that those gentlemen must be "*most unjustly and unwarrantably accused, for they have enjoyed the confidence of that loyal country. We are bound to believe, from these facts, that they never were disaffected.*"

They have believed that any journal could have had the hardihood to make the above assertion in Toronto, would, I consider, have been impossible, had I not seen it in the *Banner* of yesterday.

But you must be aware, that my objection to them is that *they do not enjoy the confidence of Upper Canada.*

If the Union were dissolved to-morrow, and if the majority of members of the new Upper Canada Assembly, should insist on voting a want of

confidence in any Executive that had not Mr. Baldwin in it, I could not object to Mr. Baldwin being in the Council on my principles ; but this would not prevent me desiring to see the force increased in the Province to protect the British Government's existence.

Upper Canada, as loyal, could not have Mr. Baldwin as its representative, were its views properly expressed. Mr. Baldwin knows that he does not represent the feelings of Upper Canada, nor even of a majority of the members from Upper Canada in the present Assembly, except upon that one vital principle, the theory of Responsible Government.

Finding that the French majority were to rule the Province, Mr. Baldwin should, in common honesty, have insisted on Mon. Lafontaine associating with the Lower Canadians, representatives from Upper Canada, truly expressive of our feelings, which he knew he and some others of his colleagues were not.

You may suppose, but it is evidently not the Governor General's opinion, that the *suspensions* of their past feelings have been lessened by the *actings* of their matured and ripened experience as public men.

No one wants to cry—"Rebel"—or to resuscitate old suspicions, however well-founded, against any who are not trying to thrust themselves or their friends into the controul of our liberties, our properties, and our lives, by *imposing their services on the State in its highest offices of trust*. But to applicants of doubtful loyalty, it is an injury to ourselves as well as to our country, not to return for answer—"No ; we do not require to try you, any more than we require to taste a cup of poison to prove it."

The Scotch thought it safe enough, while the troops remained in the country, to co-operate with Mr. Baldwin, to get, in Responsible Government, a means of getting the colony fairly represented, and this you twist into a general approval of Mr. Baldwin,—while *they* viewed their doing so as the only means of extirpating both his and the other extreme faction.

But now, every consideration will tend to make them stand up for SIR CHARLES METCALFE AND BRITISH CONNECTION, and not the least of these in the minds and hearts of Scotchmen, must be a full determination not to render equivocal the political integrity of the members of the Free Church of Scotland, at present struggling at home, for an independent, honourable and national existence.

I have, therefore, without hesitation, but with the deepest regret, to decline continuing to be supposed to approve of the course of the *Banner*, and to request you to withdraw my name from your Subscription List.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient humble Servant,

ISAAC BUCHANAN.

## LETTER V.

MR. BUCHANAN AND THE BANNER.

To George Brown, Esquire, Proprietor of the Banner.

TORONTO, 27th January, 1844.

SIR,—In answering your letter published in yesterday's *Banner*, allow me to remark, in the first place, that you may be, but I cannot be, made afraid by any threats to expose all that any one knows of me, and to beg that you will have no farther delicacy on this score, than suits yourself.

You miscall your first letter to me a *private* one; but none of your readers can fail to observe that when you wrote it, you intended it and my answer for publication, should the latter suit your purpose, although your alarm on this subject afterwards, no doubt, dictated your second letter. It, however, ill becomes you to lecture any one on "the want of the courtesy which is due from one man to another," after the way you handled your friends, the Presbyterian ministers, on the Temporalities Bill. The EXTREME measures you took, I had the fairness frankly to acknowledge, were, at the time, called for by the extreme circumstances; and if my attempt to preserve the *Banner* from party politics, is as successful as yours was to preserve our Church from ecclesiastical tyranny, I shall be quite content, as having done a service, especially in the critical position of politics in the Province, to Presbyterianism in Canada, and to the present position of the Free Church at home, even though I should have no similar acknowledgement from you of the goodness of my motives.

I feel that your now *contemptuous estimate* of and ungenerous personalities against me must only tend to reduce you to your true level in the mind of your readers, when they compare the scurrility and reckless assertions of your last number with what you said of me in the *Banner* of the 10th instant, viz.

"The author of this letter has been one of our first and most valuable supporters since our connection with the Canadian press. He stood by us when a recent attempt was made to interfere with our independence as public Journalists, and gave us most efficient assistance on the occasion, and it is with pain that we differ from him."

There is exceedingly little in the *critical* part or commencement of your letter, that is worthy of the least attention. Its closing remarks, however, which seem to be from an abler pen, call for some explanations from me.

You say, "It is a fact known to many persons in Toronto, that when the news of the resignation was confirmed, you expressed your cordial sympathy with the ousted members—and stated your belief that the country must sustain them."

I acknowledge that the above states sufficiently correctly what my view was at the time alluded to, and I also acknowledge that my then good

opinion of Mr. Baldwin's personal independence and motives (though I have always dreaded his party), led me to rely with confidence that while he continued the leading man from Upper Canada, in the Cabinet, the principle of Responsible Government at least would be sure of an honest advocate. And it is true that my anxiety to befriend and think the best of any thing that Mr. Baldwin was connected with, made me suggest your qualifying a clause of your article of 3th December, into—"But we see no reason for believing that such was not also the view of his ministers; and as such appointments would be the most popular, it is natural to suppose that they would be the very ones which the ministers would make."

I also acknowledge that (having been very much occupied otherwise at the time) I had assumed too much the hastily formed opinions of others, and that under the impression that Mr. Baldwin had not misrepresented his Excellency, I wrote to England to a party who is influential with her Majesty's Ministers, stating that if the general supposition was correct that Sir Charles Metcalfe had repudiated the practice of Responsible Government, or if even the other extreme, or high church faction, should continue to give the Republicans of the Province the advantage of being *the only party advocating the popular British principle of governing the Colony*, that the question at the elections could never be made one of "connection or no connection," and that Canada was virtually handed over to MR. BALDWIN'S PARTY, insignificantly small though it be in comparison with the number of the men in Upper Canada of truly British views, and those Lower Canadians who are at bottom deeply attached to monarchical institutions (though soured in the mean time by the infamous usage of a Colonial faction who had here *most irresponsibly* wielded British power) if these could only be got to act together from a sense of their common dangers and their common interests, and all become advocates of the popular or Responsible Government principle.

Having made these acknowledgements, I go on to explain the process of my alteration of opinion on the important matter at issue between Sir C. Metcalfe and the late Executive.

As you correctly state, I sent a copy of the letter to which I have alluded to the Governor General, and in return was assured in the strongest terms by his Excellency that the late Executive had grossly misrepresented the views of the head of the Government on the subject of Responsible Government.

I therefore took the trouble, *as the country is now doing*, to investigate the matter for myself, and the result was that I found that instead of being *martyrs for their principles*, Mr. Baldwin and the late ministers, **BY NOT RETIRING VERY SOON AFTER SIR CHARLES METCALFE'S ARRIVAL IN THE PROVINCE**, have done all that men could do to violate the cause of Responsible Government, as introduced into our Colonial constitution, by the sanction of Her Majesty's government to the Parliamentary Resolutions of 1841.

On referring to the public documents connected with the resignation, I indeed found, to my astonishment, that by Mon. Lafontaine's own admission, the late Executive had at *no time* experienced the confidence of the present Head of the Government, and in fact that since the commencement of the present administration, the Governor General has had no confidential constitutional advisers at all! I could not help saying to

myself, "but what *could* possibly be MR. BALDWIN'S object (even if all the others had proved unfaithful to the people) what *could* cause his unheard of infatuation, and make him violate the very principle of his political existence, and for which he has done so much?"

To get at a true understanding of the matter, I supposed the case of Mr. Baldwin's retiring as he ought to have done, ON SIR CHARLES METCALFE'S NOT ASKING HIS ADVICE ON EVERY MATTER ON WHICH HE (Mr. Baldwin) KNEW THE COLONISTS SUPPOSED THEIR REPRESENTATIVE IN THE COUNCIL WAS TO BE CONSULTED; and the actual state of the case then flashed on my mind.

Had Mr. Baldwin and his *patch-work colleagues* retired, when their duty to the public called them to do so, they must have become politically extinct AS A PARTY. At that time it was most true of them that *they had no sameness of objects with Upper Canada*, except as to the principle of Responsible Government, which, judging from the present case, very likely they had violated also for party purposes, by subserviency to Sir Charles Bagot's will, if the truth were known.

Mr. Baldwin had also a great source of moral weakness in his consciousness of the fact, that the late (*so much vaunted*) Executive was not without members, whom neither Upper nor Lower Canada will ever believe to be true disciples of Responsible Government!

What then could Mr. Baldwin at that period have *produced*, which his Executive had in common with Upper Canada? HIS HAPPILY UNSUCCESSFUL ATTEMPT TO UPSET LORD SYDENHAM'S PLANS OF GOVERNMENT, was his most prominent act up to that time, and for this he certainly could not expect much sympathy from Upper Canada, and in fact he must have felt that he (even he himself, and much more his colleagues,) had *no ground at all of popularity* in this part of the Province, except they could induce Mr. Cartwright and Sir Allan Macnab, and their High Church adherents, to *continue to dispute with him on the bare principles of government*, nevertheless the many warnings these politicians have had, since the time when so suicidal a course was so emphatically denounced by that true friend of the Canadas, Lord Sydenham.

MR. BALDWIN THEREFORE TO SAVE HIS PARTY, SACRIFICED THE PRINCIPLES AND INTERESTS OF HIS COUNTRY.

To save his party from political extinction in Upper Canada, Mr. Baldwin in an evil hour yielded to his *party influences*, and consented to deceive the Reformers, by remaining *in place*, long after he had ceased to be *in power*, IN ORDER THAT HE MIGHT USE THE GOVERNMENT'S INFLUENCE TO CREATE A POLITICAL CAPITAL FOR HIS PARTY, by the production of a few popular *legislative* measures, for which, American like, he just took the measure of what he calculated to be the public mind, for the time being, without being guided by any higher considerations than the mere *temporary circumstances of his party*, rather than of his country.

If proof of this were wanting, it might be had from the mouth of that great man, (though also great republican) Marshall S. Bidwell, who stated in New York, to a gentleman now in this city, that "*his wildest dream of popularizing* our institutions never went half so far as Mr. Baldwin's Township Bill, which," (said Mr. Bidwell) "*positively creates a little democracy in every township in the Province!*"

There were no assessment bills, township bills, &c. &c., introduced for Lower Canada, for they were not wanted there for party or electioneering purposes! The country must now see all Mr. Baldwin's late legislative acts, or *attempts at legislation*, as done for electioneering purposes, and will not therefore consent to give him any credit whatever for them, however good in themselves.

As to justifying his conduct in the Executive, no man with any respect for himself or for Responsible Government, could do so.

If I have not satisfied the *Banner*, I feel sure that I have satisfied the public, on the subject of what you term "the singular change which has taken place in my sentiments;" but as you are a stranger in the province, I may, for your information, mention the additional fact, that the loyal men who will henceforward probably be designated "Conservative Liberals," or "Moderates," would never have trusted Mr. Baldwin, except from the circumstance of their being encouraged to do so *by his having, at same time, enjoyed the confidence of the head of the Government*—the custodian of the prerogatives of the crown, and the rights not of a party, but of the whole population. I do not say they would not trust *any* politician, because he had forfeited the confidence of the Governor for the time being.

I merely mention the fact, that the public opinion of Mr. Baldwin's career would have prevented his being trusted apart from such guarantee, even as a means of getting Responsible Government, and much less after the popular principle is allowed by all, for Mr. Baldwin's pressure from without or party proper was always feared as anti-British.

The high opinion we entertained, as I have said, of Mr. Baldwin's personal intentions, and elevation above all motives to political vice, led us to think that the risk, we ran in co-operating with his party while he was at the head of it, and while he retained the confidence of the Head of the Government, was a less risk than to allow his party another plausible cause of rebellion, by our giving either a passive or active support (as when we opposed Mr. Baldwin's friends in Sir F. B. Head's time) to the high church faction, who might again use their power in denying equal rights, civil and religious, to all classes of the community.

I do not think that we are wrong now, in regarding Mr. Baldwin, simply as a party man, and attributing to him the disadvantages which attach to the very equivocal character of his party and the responsibility of its every act; but I think it may fairly be questioned, whether formerly we did not go too far in trusting such a party, MERELY on account of Mr. Baldwin's personal or individual virtues.

Was any fear then of our being taunted with inconsistency to prevent us, in these circumstances, from separating ourselves in the public mind from Mr. Baldwin? We surely had cause enough for doing so in his betrayal, of Responsibility to the people of the Colony, in the Executive, and thus creating the most baneful precedent, even if any doubt did exist as to his misrepresentations of His Excellency's views on this most vital subject.

Following the *Banner's* usual habit, you speak in your letter most boldly and *unadvisedly* on a variety of provincial topics on which you as a stranger cannot possibly be informed.

For instance, you say—

*“But how could you be so infatuated as to suppose that the Scotchmen of Canada would give a cordial support to an administration which had Mr. Draper at the head of it.”*

While every one in Toronto knows, but yourself, that the Scotchmen of Canada agreed with Lord Sydenham's opinion on this point, and that they supported the administration of his Lordship, most cordially though it contained not only Mr. Draper but also Mr. Sullivan, a politician much more objectionable to them from his even greater inconsistency, and from his foolish habit of sneering at every thing *Scotch* on all occasions. When Lord Sydenham (on great promises being made by some of Mr. Baldwin's friends and relations that they would not attend any more “agitation” meetings) agreed to take Mr. Baldwin into office (in a situation subordinate to Mr. Draper, the then Attorney General) many, even liberal men, honestly objected to Mr. Baldwin's *personal safety*, influenced as they knew him to be by a “cabal” (as Mr. Sullivan used to call it) in Toronto and the fourth riding of York. They said “they could not *conscientiously* support Mr. Baldwin.” “I don't ask you,” replied Lord Sydenham, “to trust *individually* any member of my Council; I ask you to support *my* administration *as a whole*, and on the ground of *our* Executive acts and Legislative measures *as a Government*.”

As then the members of the new government of Sir Charles Metcalfe will not be permitted by his Excellency to enter his Council (this is the Governor General's and the Home Government's *unalterable resolution*) except on the principles of the fullest responsibility of the Executive Councillors to the House of Assembly, and with the knowledge that the new College Bill will be introduced into Parliament as a Government measure early in the ensuing session, the Scotch population in Canada will on THEIR PRINCIPLES (and nevertheless any efforts of the Banner), *they themselves not being office-seekers*, support Sir Charles Metcalfe's government, let the Councillors be who they may, while our countrymen retain their present unbounded confidence in the head of the government. I trust and feel sure that so dark a day for those Provinces will never come, as will find 200,000 Presbyterians forgetting their national principles and becoming the tools of any Provincial party whatever. Independent Scotchmen, at all events, will never give *their* support to an Executive Council whose members could be charged with behaving as Mr. Baldwin has done in the late Government, not understanding, or not acting on his conviction that, it was *his right as the Representative of the Colonists at the Council Board*, to be advised with on every matter affecting their interests, and his solemn duty to retire from the Council when not consulted.

Nor will any consideration (not even a separate endowment for Presbyterians) induce Scotchmen to support at the hustings, the adherents of any administration which is not PUBLICLY AND UNEQUIVOCALLY pledged to throw open the advantages of King's College to all denominations of Christians equally.

They of course object, as *Scotchmen*, to the present unjust exclusion of Presbyterianism from the incalculable advantages of the munificent Provincial endowment of King's College; but they object still more, as *Britons true*, to the danger to “*connexion with the land of our fathers*,” which so exclusive an institution must gradually precipitate.

Situated, as Canada is, alongside of the United States, we know that Republicanism will, at times, become an alarming element among us, and that its power here is to be dreaded just in the proportion that wrong or illiberal principles, exclusiveness or Toryism, are fostered and increased in the colony; and we believe that, left in its present unpopular Episcopal state, King's College is little better than a hot-bed and nursery of provincial Toryism; and provincial Toryism we have always found, both in Upper and Lower Canada, just as *impatient* of British control, and just as anti-British in its views of its peculiar interests, and the prescriptive importance of its individuals, as is the Republicanism of either province, although the members of the former faction have certainly this in common with us (which the Republicans have not), that in the hour of the country's need, they have stood with us in support of the British principles.

Your ignorant self-sufficiency on the above subject, is of a piece with that which the *Banner* has so often committed. Take, for example, the *Banner's* notice of the School Bill.

*Any one* of your friends could have told you the experience of Upper Canada, that the absence of a proper common school system, and of *British* or provincial schoolmasters and school books, had introduced American teachers and American school books into the province to an alarming extent, prior to 1837; and that, in fact, the baneful influence of these had been a main instrument in exciting in the country a spirit of rebellion against every thing British.

So much was this the case, that even the late Executive *did not dare* to propose by their School bill, that Americans should be eligible, *according to law*, as teachers, after January, 1846; yet the *Banner* must needs take upon itself to object to the exclusion of American teachers!

Let me tell you, Sir, that an interested and intelligent public will judge you *by your acts*, and not by your *words*; and that if you, in such a way as I have stated, or by unprincipled opposition to Sir Charles Metcalfe, for your own personal objects, with the members of an extreme political faction, or if in any other way you can be shown to be practically promoting Republican views, among the Presbyterian population of Canada, your well written tirades against speculative Republicanism, as you found it in the neighbouring Republic (although from that country you will persist in still borrowing so many of your views), will fall as idly on the public ear, as did Mr. Baldwin's *professions* of devotion to the cause of "the connexion with England" (see his speech, at two different parts, at the Toronto demonstration).

No *words* that Mr. Baldwin can use, will ever make up for his want of *acting* in defence of the British Government, in the hour of its need, (although he held at the time a Captain's Commission in the Militia) so no professions or lip-loyalty of yours, will prevent people judging you by such Republican tendencies as you have evinced, in your remarks to which I have just alluded, and in the countenance and assistance you give to a Republican faction, in its attempt to coerce and misrepresent to the Presbyterian population, the representative of her Majesty in this colony.

Your making the Governor General, or your more humble political opponents, appear to your readers to disadvantage (and, imperfect as all men are, it requires no great talent to be a good fault-finder), does not and never can prove to the public, that you or Mr. Baldwin have any

greater claim to the confidence of your countrymen, than what arises from your own political safety, and the *acts* (not *words* like yours, or *acts on paper* like Mr. Baldwin's) done in this Province.

I refer to these things thus publicly, because the opinions of the *Banner* derive much of their importance, from the erroneous impression being very general amongst Presbyterians at a distance, that its sentiments and provincial or local information are advised upon by you, with a committee of "your first and most valued supporters," the gentlemen in this city and neighbourhood, who, as it now turns out, unfortunately for them and the other Presbyterians of the Province, and perhaps for yourselves also, induced the *Banner* to remove from New York to Toronto.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

ISAAC BUCHANAN.